

**City of Warwick Planning Board
Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Members Present: Carter Thomas Vice-Chairman
George Arnold
Philip Slocum
Attilio Iacobucci
Jeanne Foster
Vincent Gambardella
Thomas Chadronet

Members Absent: Michael Constantine
John J. Mulhearn Jr.

Also in attendance: John DeLucia, City Engineer
Eric Hindinger, Assistant City Engineer
John Earle, Solicitor
Trish Reynolds, Business Development Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

On the motion of Mr. Chadronet, seconded by Mr. Slocum, the Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the January 2006 meeting minutes.

Public Meeting

Minor Subdivision

Cataldo Subdivision

Applicant: Henry Cataldo
Location: 271 Potowomut Road
Assessor's Plat: 213
Lot(s): 9
Zoning District: Residential A-7
Land Area: 11,028 square feet
Number of lots: 2
Engineer: Environmental Planning & Surveying, Inc.
Ward: 9

Mr. Henry Cataldo represented himself and was requesting preliminary approval to subdivide one lot to create two new lots, one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development on an existing street in a Residential A-7 zoning district.

Mr. Cataldo explained that the subdivision conformed to all of the City's Zoning Regulations and that he would like to create a second lot to be built upon.

There were no questions from the Planning board or the public. The Planning Board then heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

The Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulation:

- 1) That the City Engineer shall approve the final plan prior to recording.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Chadronet, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulation.

Public Hearing

Major Change to a Recorded Plat

Kenneth Avenue

Applicant: Bella Signora Properties, LLC.
Location: Kenneth Avenue
Assessor's Plat: 350
Lot(s): 718 - 723
Zoning District: Residential A-10
Land Area: 1.95 Acres
Number of lots: 6
Engineer: Siegmund and Associate, Inc.
Ward: 5

Attorney, John C. Revens represented the applicant and was requesting a major change to recorded plat to rectify a disputed property line in a Residential A-10 Zoning District. The attorney explained that the current owner had purchased an approved development consisting of four record lots and a new street and that a property line dispute arose during construction of the street.

The Board recognized Mr. John DeLucia the City Engineer who requested that the surveyor of record explain the circumstances of the dispute.

Mr. Norbert Therion, PLS for the development offered a brief explanation that the dispute was related to the location of the westerly property line and that there were competing surveys. Mr. Therian explained that the property owners conceded the disputed property and were proposing to record a new plan relocating the property line.

The City Engineer then expanded upon the surveyor's explanation and informed the Planning Board that there were still issues with two existing lots fronting on Stanfield Street which were excluded from the application and the discussion. Mr. Delucia explained that he wanted the Board to be fully informed about the overall circumstances regarding the subdivision and the property line issues. He explained that the two lots on Stanfield Street also have property line issues related to the location of the pavement within the street right-of-way. Mr. DeLucia concluded his comment by informing the Planning Board that the attorney had agreed to use his best faith based effort to resolve the Stanfield Street issue with a future subdivision.

Attorney Revens responded that his client does not own the lots on Stanfield Street and was not responsible for the condition of that property. He did explain however that he knew the owners and had contacted the original developer of the subdivision and that he would use his best efforts to rectify the situation on Stanfield Street.

Board member Foster asked is the original subdivision was performed by one owner and if now there were two owners of the property.

Attorney Revens confirmed that fact.

Being no further questions or testimony, the Planning Board then opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ronald Larviere of 40 Yates Avenue was concerned that the new road was too close to his property. He explained that the road was supposed to be ten (10') feet away from his property but was now within six (6') feet of his back yard. He stated that he was concerned about the safety issues with cars speeding down the road and that there was not enough distance between the road and his property. He also explained that the developer had cut down some of his trees when they installed the road.

Ms. Mandi DelBonis of 50 Yates Avenue explained that the developer had removed her fence and she would like her property returned to the original condition.

Mr. Joseph McConnery of 59 Page Street explained that he was assured that the developer would install a fence along his property line during the original approval process and he wanted to make sure that the new developer would be required to follow through with the fence.

Being no further public comment, the Planning Board closed the public hearing.

The attorney attempted to argue that the new plan did not include a fence and that the applicant was under no obligation to install a fence as part of the development.

The Planning Staff explained that there was testimony on behalf of the original applicant that a fence would be erected around the perimeter of the development and that the final approved plans did include the fence as an element of the plan.

The Planning Board disagreed with the attorney's position on the fence and explained that it was not a matter to be acted on by the board at this hearing.

Being no further comment the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.

- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

The Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval of the re-plat (major change) with all of the elements of the original approval to remain and final approval to be through the Administrative Officer.

On the motion of Mr. Iacobucci, seconded by Mr. Arnold, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval the with all of the elements of the original approval to remain and final approval to be through the Administrative Officer.

Public Hearing

Major Land Development Project

Centerville Gardens

Applicant:	Offshore Development, LLC
Location:	1209 Centerville Road
Assessor's Plat:	250
Lot(s):	3
Zoning District:	Residential A-15
Land Area:	2.73 acres
Number of lots:	NA
Engineer:	Ocean state Planners, Inc.
Ward:	8

Attorney John Harrington represented the applicant and was requesting Master Plan approval of a Major Land Development Project to construct nine new residential condominium units on a lot with an existing single family dwelling in order to establish a 10-unit residential condominium development in a Residential A-15 Zoning District.

Attorney Harrington then introduced Mr. Richard Bzdyra of Ocean State Planners who explained the details of the project. Mr. Bzdyra explained that the property was located along Centerville Road, was abutting Valley Country Club to the West and single family to the north and east.

The attorney then informed the Board that the developers had met with the Country Club and that the club had no objections to the proposal. He also informed the Board that the developers had met with the other abutters and agreed to install a fence and to leave as much of the natural vegetation as possible to insure privacy.

Mr. Bzdyra also explained that there was an existing single family home on the property that would become part of the condominium complex. He informed the Board that the lot had 185 feet of frontage on Centerville Road; he further explained that under the current density the property could be developed for 16 units with a zone change under the Planned District Residential (PDR). Mr. Bzdyra continued his presentation by informing the Board that the development would meet all zoning requirements, the structures would be approximately 158 feet away from the property lines and that the development would consist of upscale townhouses with garages.

Mr. Bzdyra described the topography of the property and informed the Board that there was some ledge present. He explained that the developers hoped to avoid blasting by chipping for utilities and that he thought the building could be built while avoiding the ledge.

Board member Thomas expressed his concern about blasting.

The Planning Board listened to public comment.

Mr. Jerry Jabour of 36 Fishes Lane had concerns about the value of the development and the fact that the units would only have one car garages. Mr. Jabour also expressed a concern that there were wetlands present on the site and was opposed to blasting. Mr. Jabour concluded his statements by asking that the fence be located 35 feet inside the property, asked that there be no building within the setbacks and that the parking lots be screened with evergreens.

Ms. Willow Dean Schofield of 1253 Centerville Road stated that there was a sever traffic problem on Centerville Road and thought that the development would make a bad situation worse. She also questioned if there was sufficient water available from the Kent County Water Authority (KCWA).

Mr. Walter Jeffery of 20 Quail Ridge Lane asked if the development would have private plowing and trash removal. He was also concerned about the price range and property values in the area.

The applicants responded that the plowing would be private but that the City provided trash removal to condominiums. The applicants also stated that the units would range from \$300,000 to \$350,000.

Mr. Manuel Perry of 34 Quail Ridge Lane was opposed to blasting and thought the price range was marginal. He also stated that there were wetlands nearby at the West View Nursing Home in West Warwick. Mr. Perry concluded his comments with traffic concerns on Centerville Road.

Ms. Stephanie Paolino of 20 Fishes Lane was concerned about the capability of the development with the surrounding properties. She requested an eight foot fence, that the dumpsters be located close to Centerville Road, that there be no blasting. She also questioned if the units would have patio or decks.

Ms. Paolino was informed that the maximum allowable fence height in the City is six (6') feet.

Mr. Paolino was concerned about a cut-through to the golf course.

Being no further public comment the Planning Board closed the public hearing.

Attorney Harrington summed his presentation by expressing his reservation about locating a fence 35' into the property. He stated that there would be 150 foot natural buffer between the development and the abutting properties, in particular the golf course.

Mr. Bzdyra explained that the property could be divided into six single family house lots resulting in more traffic and less open space.

Board member reiterated the point that the development would include a 158 foot undisturbed wooded buffer.

Being no further comment the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance. However, requiring a Special Use Permit from the Zoning Board of Review.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant Master Plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall receive a Special Use Permit from the City's Zoning

Board of Review.

- 2) That the preliminary plan shall include the direction and distance to the nearest intersecting street, existing and proposed grading, all existing and proposed utilities and dimensions for the proposed access easement.
- 3) That prior to preliminary approval the applicant shall submit a storm-water management plan to be approved by the City Engineer which consists of underground infiltration to the maximum extent practicable and shall be designed in accordance with all state and local regulations.
- 4) That prior to preliminary approval the applicant shall submit a sewer capacity flow analysis stamped by a Certified Professional Engineer to be approved by the Warwick Sewer Authority.
- 5) That prior to preliminary approval the applicant shall secure the approval of the West Warwick Sewer Authority to connect to the sanitary sewer system.
- 6) That prior to preliminary approval the applicant shall submit a landscape plan prepared and stamped by a Registered Landscape Architect to be approved by the City's Landscape Project Coordinator which shall include the limit of work beyond which existing trees shall be preserved, shade trees around the parking area and along the access road, and plantings around the buildings.

On the motion of Mr. Chadronet, seconded by Mr. Arnold and Mr. Gambardella, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant Master Plan approval with all of the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Public Hearing

Major Land Development Project

Blomberg Subdivision

Applicant:	Karen Blomberg, Donna Morris and Jason Sirois
Location:	6 Langley Street
Assessor's Plat:	360
Lot(s):	480 - 483
Zoning District:	Residential A-7
Land Area:	21,360 square feet
Number of lots:	3
Engineer:	Armand Desvoyaux, PLS
Ward:	6

Attorney Daniel Flaherty represented the applicant and was requesting Master Plan approval of a

Major Subdivision to subdivide four lots and create three lots, two lots with existing residences and one new lot for development with less than the required frontage and lot width in a Residential A-7 Zoning District.

The attorney informed the Board that the applicant has lived in her current home ten years and intends to reside in the new house that is being proposed. He further stated that the two lots with existing homes would meet all zoning requirements and that the proposed new lot is only eight feet short on the corner property line.

The attorney further stated that the proposed new lot was in conformance with the rest of the neighborhood because there were several homes on undersized lots and this lot would not be undersized.

There being no questions from the board and no public comment, the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) Not in compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance; therefore, requiring a Zoning Board of Review variance to have a lot with less than the required frontage and lot width.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant Master Plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall receive a Variance from the City's Zoning Board of Review to have a lot with less than the required frontage and lot width.
- 2) That the preliminary plan shall depict the edge of pavement and right-of-way line on the opposite side of the street, all structures on abutting properties, and that the proposed changes to the configuration shall be clarified on the plan.

- 3) That the lowest floor, including basement, of the proposed dwelling shall be at least 3-feet above the maximum high ground water elevation.
- 4) That all existing and proposed dwellings shall be connected to the Warwick Sewer system.
- 5) That the existing oak tree located at the corner of Horse Neck Road shall be preserved during construction.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Chadronet, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant Master Plan approval with all of the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Public Hearing

Major Subdivision

Mallards Nest Subdivision

Applicant:	Richard Ellis
Location:	71 Mellon Road
Assessor's Plat:	350
Lot(s):	584
Zoning District:	Residential A-10
Land Area:	1.12 Acres
Number of lots:	2
Engineer:	Walker Engineering, LTD.
Ward:	5

Attorney K. Joseph Shekarchi represented the applicant and was requesting preliminary approval to subdivide a 1.12 acre lot to create two new lots with less than the required frontage and lot width, one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development on an existing street in a Residential A-10 Zoning District.

Attorney Shekarchi explained that the proposed subdivision had received Master Plan approval from the Planning Board and Zoning Board approval to have two lots with less than the required frontage and lot width. He further explained that the applicant had met with City Staff and agreed to construct a single level home on the site. The attorney concluded his presentation by informing the Board that the applicant had no objection to the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Being no question from the Planning Board and no public comment the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes

and General Statements” of the City’s Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City’s Zoning Ordinance having received Zoning Board of Review approval Petition # 9204 to have two lots with less than the required frontage and lot width.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable, and:
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

The Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer with the following stipulations:

- 1) That all stipulations contained in Zoning Board of Review Petition #9204 shall be adhered to.
- 2) That both properties shall be connected to the Warwick Sewer System.
- 3) That the final plan shall depict the storm drain pipe that runs from Mellon Road to Little Pond.
- 4) That an easement shall be granted in the northeast corner of the proposed new lot for the electric service to the existing dwelling.
- 5) That the existing large cedar tree located on the bank of the pond should be preserved and protected with drip-line tree protection prior to any construction activity.

On the motion of Mr. Gambardella, seconded by Mr. Arnold, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department’s findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department’s recommended stipulations.

Public Hearing

Major Land Development Project Preliminary Approval

Crossings Office Park and Residences

Applicant: Bellecastle Realty
Location: Greenwich Avenue
Assessor's Plat: 257
Lot(s): 10 & 13
Zoning District: Planned District Residential (PDR) A-7 and Office
Land Area: 48 Acres
Number of lots: NA
Engineer: Garofalo & Associates Incorporated
Ward: 8

Attorney K. Joseph Shekarchi represented the applicant and was requesting preliminary approval of a Major Land Development Project to develop a 24 acre site in order to construct 288 residential condominiums and apartments exceeding the maximum height in a Planned District Residential (PDR) A-7 Zoning District with dimensional relief from Zoning Regulations.

Attorney Shekarchi explained that the development had received Master Plan approval from the Planning Board and a Zone Change from the City Council in 2003 but that the Zone Change had been appealed to the Rhode Island Superior Court. The attorney further explained that the appeal was not resolved until June 2005. As a result, the 2003 Master Plan had not expired and was still active.

Attorney Shekarchi explained that the applicant was now seeking preliminary approval for the residential portion of the development only and that construction would be scheduled for late spring early summer 2006.

Attorney Shekarchi then addressed some concerns of the Continental Little League, a tenant of the subject property. The attorney stated that the little league had five concerns which the applicant was willing to address.

1. Reimbursement of \$4,800 dollars to the league for a well repairs within 24 hours of an approval.
2. Bellecastle (the property owner) to assume all future responsibility for the well.
3. That water and natural gas service would be provided to the little league during the first part of the construction schedule.

4. That before the start of the baseball season an access roadway and lighting would be provided.
5. That unobstructed access would be provided throughout the little league baseball season.

Following the presentation, John Earle the City Solicitor, explained for the record that he might have a potential conflict of interest in that his partner had performed some zoning work for the applicant on this site in 1998 and that he would recuse himself at the request of the Planning Board and/or the applicant.

There was no objection from the Board or the applicant to Mr. Earle's participation on the matter.

Attorney Shekarchi then addressed the Planning Board stipulation individually and clarified certain issues related to the stipulations. The Planning Department concurred with the attorney's presentation.

The attorney then informed the Board that the applicant had secured all required State of Rhode Island permits including a RIDOT physical alteration permit and a RIDEM wetlands permit and underground injection control (UIC) permit.

The Board then accepted public comments.

Mr. Derek Anderson of 2 Gilbert Street stated that the project would be of a high quality but he was concerned about the water supply from the Kent County Water Authority (KCWA) and the future of the little league.

Attorney Shekarchi responded that the applicant had performed a water study for the KCWA and that water pressure and quality were adequate.

Mr. Michael Grady of 106 Northbridge Avenue was concerned about access to the water and sewer connections.

Ms. Donna Grady was concerned about building height.

Mr. Kelly Coates of the Carpionato Corporation, the developer of the property, assured Mr. Grady that water and sewer access would be from Greenwich Avenue.

Attorney Shekarchi showed Ms. Grady the locations of the buildings with height relief and explained that they were not abutting her property.

Site Engineer Mr. Nick Pompiano explained that approximately three feet (3') of fill would be necessary on the site to accommodate the drainage.

Ms. Karen Lynch Bernardo represented the Continental Little League and informed the Board that she had submitted a letter to the Administrative Officer, Mr. Carruolo, expressing the issues and concerns of the little league.

Mr. Kyle Skinner of Vancouver Avenue was concerned about the setbacks of the buildings.

The Mr. Coates explained that there was a 50' buffer as part of the zone change and that the buffer would be planted with evergreens.

Mr. Hrabchek of the Pontiac Village Association talked about traffic along Route 5 and expressed his desire for all developers along Route 5 to participate in traffic improvements including the reconstruction of the roadway in order to help the neighborhoods in the area.

Mr. Frank Bruzzi of 181 Greenwich Avenue was concerned about time of construction and the price range for the units.

Mr. Coates explained that the first phase of the development would be complete in the late winter early spring 2007 and he assured the Planning Board that the time construction would conform to all local ordinances. Mr. Coates further explained that the condominium units would range in price from \$300,000 to \$500,000 depending on size for two to three bedrooms.

Ms. Beth Sounder of 19 Vancouver Avenue was concerned about the location of the access road, building heights lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Richard Bourbon, Registered Landscape Architect, Garafalo explained that the roadway had been shifter away from Vancouver Avenue and to the north that the buildings with height relief are not in proximity to Vancouver Avenue, that the lighting would be directed onto the property and evergreen trees would be planted between the development and the abutting residential properties to the south.

Mr. Robert Lord of Greenwood Commons was concerned about the embankment to the rear of his development, grading and landscaping.

The landscape architect explained that the embankment would be untouched except for a low 2 to 3 foot retaining wall and some landscape enhancements along the bottom of the slope.

Being no further questions or comments the Planning Board closed the public meeting.

Board member Slocum stated that while he thought the project would be a quality development he would like to have some teeth included in the Continental Little League agreement so that enforcement could be assured.

The attorney for the developer assured the Planning Board that the property owner would abide by the agreement and stated that the developer would be back before the board for future

developments so that it would be in the developer's best interest to abide by the agreement.

Being no further discussion the Planning Board then heard the Planning Departments comments.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance PCO -27-03.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable, and:
- 5) That the proposed subdivision possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That on the Final Plan, Utility Note No. 1 should be revised; "Design Engineer" should replace "Department of Public Works".
- 2) That on the Final Plan, a note stating that the Design Engineer will submit an As-Built plan and a Certificate of Conformance on all elements of the storm drainage system must be added to the Utility Notes. The As-Built Drawing and the Certificate must be submitted and approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy
- 3) That on the Final Plan, a note must be added that the Contractor must obtain approval from the City of Warwick Building Department for a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Application prior to the commencement of any construction activities.
- 4) That the Design Engineer should give consideration to the use of the existing fill material on-site; there appears to be large amounts of debris and large rock fragments mixed into the fill piles.

- 5) That the landscape plan shall be amended to include the closure of the Old East Avenue emergency access including removal of the asphalt and the installation of a berm and plantings to be approved by the City's Landscape Project Coordinator prior to final approval.
- 6) That the developer shall perform a traffic analysis and fund the installation of traffic calming alternatives designed to discourage cut through traffic resulting from the development as deemed appropriate by the Warwick City Council for the Greenwood neighborhood.
- 7) That prior to final approval the number and locations of fire hydrants shall be approved by the Fire Marshall's Office.
- 8) That stipulations number 5, 7 & 8, as approved in Warwick City Council Zone Change PCO-22-98, shall be included as stipulations integral to the current proposed zone change.
- 9) That final approval shall be issued by the Planning Board upon conformance with stipulations 3, 4 and PCO-22-98 stipulation 7.
- 10) That all dumpsters shall be located within the buildings and all trash pick-up shall be privately contracted.
- 11) That buildings 5, 6, 7, 12 and 13 located along Route 95 shall be allowed to be 70 ft. high; buildings 8, 9, 10 and 11 near East Avenue shall be allowed to be 55 feet high; all other building shall seek relief from the maximum height allowance if necessary.

On the motion of Mr. Chadronet, seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Bond Reduction

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Chadronet, the Planning Board voted unanimously grants the full release of the Scolly Street Bond.

Scolly Street

Current bond total	\$1,500.00
<u>Amount to be released</u>	<u>\$1,500.00</u>
	Full Release

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 PM.